

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 10-24 are withdrawn from consideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In their previous Amendment, Applicants amended independent claim 1 to recite that “the touch sensitive active region is defined responsive to a pressure applied to the display screen by the user.” The Examiner points out the specification does not support the recitation that the touch sensitive active region is defined by pressure. Rather, the application discloses (at paragraph 0021) that pressure data is used “to define further the contact area or point.” Independent claim 1 has been amended to conform to the specification paragraph 0021; that is, to recite “a contact area of the touch sensitive active region is further defined responsive to a pressure applied to the display screen by the user contact with the display element.” Applicants believe this amendment is fully responsive to the Examiner’s concerns.

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala and further in view of Barker, all previously cited, and also in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,610 (Beaton). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker, Beaton and further in view of Banks (previously cited). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker, Beaton and further in view of Debrus (previously cited). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker, Beaton and further in view of Ross (previously cited). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker, Beaton and further in view of Cross (previously cited). These rejections are respectfully

traversed. Applicants hereby request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the following arguments.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of independent claim 1, this claim has been amended to recite that the contact area corresponds in size to a human finger tip, and is further defined responsive to pressure applied to the screen. This amendment is fully supported, for example, at paragraphs 0008 and 0021 of the present application. No new matter has been added. This feature enables a user to operate the present invention without a stylus, whether the user touches it with a gloved or ungloved finger (*see*, paragraph 0008 of the present application).

None of the cited Kawasaki, Szukala, Barker, and Beaton references teaches or even suggests this feature of amended claim 1. The Beaton reference teaches modifying a touch screen graphical user interface (GUI) depending on whether a finger or a stylus is used to touch the screen (Beaton at col. 6:40-43). However, Beaton does not use pressure to *further* define a finger tip-sized contact area, as claimed. Beaton uses pressure to determine only if the contact area should be finger tip-sized or stylus-sized. *See*, Beaton at col. 7:11-19.

The cited references do not teach or even suggest the claimed display element of amended claim 1 having a contact area corresponding in size to a human finger tip, and further defined responsive to pressure applied to a screen. Therefore, any combination of these references, however made, would still be missing this claimed feature, and it would not have been obvious to add this feature to any Kawasaki/Szukala/Barker/Beaton combination to yield the invention of claim 1.

Consequently, claim 1 is patentable, as are claims 2-4 and 7, which depend from claim 1.

Regarding the obviousness rejections of claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 based on Kawasaki, Szukala, Barker, and Beaton in combination with Banks, Debrus, Ross or Cross, none of the

additional cited references teaches or suggests the recited display element of amended claim 1, from which these claims depend. Therefore, any combination of Kawasaki, Szukala, Barker, and Beaton with these references, however made, would be missing this claimed feature, and it would not have been obvious to add this feature to any Kawasaki/Szukala/Barker/Beaton/Banks/Debrus/Ross/Cross combination.

Consequently, claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 are patentable.

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina

Registration No. 33,424

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM/llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 18, 2011

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**